

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/790,712	03/03/2004	Mignard Francois	21029-00272-US	4299	
30678 759	90 11/28/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY	BOVE LODGE & HUT	ZHENG,	ZHENG, LOIS L		
P.O. BOX 2207 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-2207			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		•	1742		
		·	DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 11/28/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_
γ
0

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/790,712	FRANCOIS; MIGNARD			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Lois Zheng	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 M	<u>arch 2006</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	ix parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and all accomposed are all accomposed and accomposed are all all accomposed and accomposed are all all all accomposed are all all all all all all all all all al	epted or b) objected to by the led drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati nty documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/790,712

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claim 3 is amended in view of the preliminary amendment filed 3 March 2004. Therefore, claims 1-12 are currently under examination.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-6, drawn to a process, classified in class 148, subclass 276...
 - II. Claims 7-12, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 118, subclass 419.
- 3. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as a galvanizing process wherein the steel strip is not subjected to an oxidation treatment.
- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required

because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. A telephone call was made to Morris Liss on 10 November 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,712

Art Unit: 1742

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lois Zheng whose telephone number is (571) 272-1248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LLZ

ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED
TECH 12201 V 0000000 1700

Page 4